

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
BEAUMONT DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA		DOCKET NO. 1:16CR26
		APRIL 12, 2018
VS.		
		10:51 A.M.
CHRISTOPHER CRAMER AND		
RICKY FACKRELL		BEAUMONT, TEXAS

VOLUME 1 OF 1, PAGES 1 THROUGH 26

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF EXCERPT OF
VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF PROSPECTIVE JUROR 66

BEFORE THE HONORABLE MARCIA A. CRONE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

FOR THE GOVERNMENT:	JOSEPH BATTE JOHN CRAFT U.S. ATTORNEY'S OFFICE 350 MAGNOLIA SUITE 150 BEAUMONT, TEXAS 77701
	SONIA JIMENEZ DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE CRIMINAL DIVISION 1331 F. STREET NW, 6TH FLOOR WASHINGTON, DC 20530
FOR CHRIS CRAMER:	DOUGLAS BARLOW ATTORNEY AT LAW 707 TEXAS AVENUE S SUITE 216D COLLEGE STATION, TEXAS 77840

DEFENDANT'S
EXHIBIT

1

1:16CR26

Tonya B. Jackson, RPR-CRR
409.654.2833

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

GEORGE PATRICK BLACK
FEDERAL PUBLIC DEFENDER
110 NORTH COLLEGE
SUITE 1122
TYLER, TEXAS 75702

FOR RICKY FACKRELL: GERALD BOURQUE
ROBERT MORROW
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
24 WATERWAY AVENUE
SUITE 660
THE WOODLANDS, TEXAS 77380

COURT REPORTER: TONYA B. JACKSON, RPR-CRR
FEDERAL OFFICIAL REPORTER
300 WILLOW, SUITE 239
BEAUMONT, TEXAS 77701

PROCEEDINGS REPORTED USING COMPUTERIZED STENOGRAPHY;
TRANSCRIPT PRODUCED VIA COMPUTER-AIDED TRANSCRIPTION.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION BY MR. BARLOW	4
VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION BY MR. MORROW	14
VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION BY MR. CRAFT	21
COURT REPORTER'S CERTIFICATION	26

1 [OPEN COURT, DEFENDANTS PRESENT.]

2 (Prospective Juror 66 enters the courtroom.)

3 (Oath administered.)

4 THE COURT: All right, Ms. Stanley. After

10:51AM

5 answering your questions last week, are there any answers
6 that you would want to change that you can think of at
7 this time?

8 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, ma'am.

9 THE COURT: Very well. I'll hand it over to

10:51AM

10 the lawyers.

11 VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF PROSPECTIVE JUROR 66

12 BY MR. BARLOW:

13 Q. Good morning, Ms. Stanley.

14 A. Morning.

10:51AM

15 Q. Hi. I'm Doug Barlow; and along with Mr. Black, we
16 represent Mr. Cramer. We want to visit with you about
17 some of your answers here and some general principles.
18 Okay?

19 Let's start out with Question No. 38. You

10:52AM

20 answered that and told us that your husband was an MP in
21 the military?

22 A. Yes, sir.

23 Q. Okay. How long did he serve as an MP?

24 A. That part, I'm not sure. We just -- we met after
25 he retired from the military.

10:52AM

1 Q. Okay.

2 A. And just recently got married. We have been
3 married about three years.

4 Q. Okay.

10:52AM 5 A. So, the particulars on the amount of time that he
6 served as that duty, I'm not sure.

7 Q. Okay. Well, in cases like this, criminal cases, a
8 lot of times there are law enforcement people who
9 testify. Just by virtue of you knowing about your
10:52AM 10 husband's service as a police officer, you wouldn't give
11 any added credibility to someone who testified just
12 because they're a police officer, would you?

13 A. I don't feel that I would, no.

14 Q. Okay. Some people believe that they're more
10:52AM 15 believable just because they're a peace officer.

16 A. Well --

17 Q. Any problem -- tell me how you feel about that.

18 A. I feel that they should be.

19 Q. They should be. That's true.

10:53AM 20 A. Yes.

21 Q. But the law says that you have to judge each
22 witness on an even plane and decide whether they're
23 telling the truth or they're not telling the truth and it
24 wouldn't be fair for a witness to come in and
10:53AM 25 automatically have some added credibility --

1 A. True.

2 Q. -- when you haven't even heard the evidence.

3 A. Sure. Yes.

4 Q. You agree with that?

10:53AM 5 A. Yes, sir.

6 Q. And Question No. 47 on page 9, you mentioned that
7 you think the effectiveness of the criminal justice
8 system has been hampered by social media. Can you tell
9 me a little more about that?

10:53AM 10 A. Well, I'm a schoolteacher; and I've watched the
11 children's attitudes change toward our criminal justice
12 system, more or less. They think -- a lot of them think
13 that the police are the bad guys, and that's how I -- I
14 think a lot of that has to do with social media and the
10:54AM 15 things they see and hear on social media.

16 Q. Okay. Anything about that that would affect your
17 jury service, though?

18 A. No, sir.

19 Q. Okay. Question No. 61, you told us about your
10:54AM 20 prior jury service; and that kind of bothered you
21 apparently, your service, about how that went down?

22 A. A little bit, yes, sir.

23 Q. Tell me a little bit about that.

24 A. Well, they picked a jury and they just walked
10:54AM 25 us -- from what I remember, they just walked us by this

1 lady that was sitting in confinement and she was in a
2 straight jacket and then sent us into a room to decide
3 whether or not she was competent and that seemed to be --
4 I mean, it was hard to me to decide if someone is
10:54AM 5 competent when you see them in that state.

6 Q. How long ago was that?

7 A. It's been years ago. I couldn't even tell you how
8 long ago it was.

9 Q. And where was that?

10:55AM 10 A. In Jefferson, here.

11 Q. Okay. Well, long ago you had to have a jury to
12 determine competence; and it may have been an agreed
13 thing.

14 A. It seemed like it was already done.

10:55AM 15 Q. And now they can waive a jury and have the judge
16 make that determination, but it was just the way the
17 system used to work. They had -- they may have a jury to
18 do it and even though all sides agreed.

19 A. Okay.

10:55AM 20 Q. So, that may have been why that happened.

21 A. Okay.

22 Q. Let's talk about the death penalty issues a little
23 bit, starting out with Question 73.

24 You told us a lot in 72 about how you feel
10:55AM 25 about the death penalty, but you indicated in 73 that you

1 don't have any opinion at all about -- either for or
2 against the death penalty. Okay?

3 A. Well, I read the other ones. Like A said it would
4 make it difficult for me as a juror to reach a verdict of
10:56AM 5 guilty or not guilty, and I didn't feel that that was --
6 my opinion would make it difficult.

7 And then -- it was just a matter of
8 elimination as I read them.

9 Q. Okay. The next question, 74, you indicated the
10:56AM 10 very top that said you feel strongly that it is important
11 that we have the death penalty as punishment.

12 A. Well, I think we need a penalty as strong as the
13 death penalty.

14 Q. Okay.

10:56AM 15 A. I feel it should fit the crime sometimes.

16 Q. Okay. Tell me a little bit more about your
17 feelings about the death penalty, why we ought to have it
18 and what purpose you think it serves.

19 A. Well, I think when someone commits a crime that
10:57AM 20 they're found guilty of, sometimes it -- the penalty
21 should be the death penalty.

22 Q. Okay.

23 A. And I don't know -- I really -- before this I had
24 never really given it a whole lot of thought.

10:57AM 25 Q. Okay. Some people believe that -- kind of the old

1 "eye for an eye" theory, that if you take a life, you
2 should forfeit your life; and other people believe the
3 death penalty is something we really ought to use just as
4 a last resort if there's nothing else we can do about an
10:57AM 5 individual that's been convicted of capital murder.

6 Do you see how there's those different
7 extremes?

8 A. Yes. I wouldn't say I'm really an "eye for an
9 eye" because there are circumstances for murder -- you
10:57AM 10 know, there are times when I guess you would say that's
11 justifiable, you know, if you --

12 Q. Well, if it's justifiable -- you have to get past
13 that hurdle. If it's justifiable or it's legally
14 excused, it's not a crime at all.

10:58AM 15 A. Okay.

16 Q. So, it's only those cases where somebody has been
17 convicted of that premeditated capital murder that you
18 ever face those issues.

19 A. Okay.

10:58AM 20 Q. And if you sat on the jury, you would have to
21 listen to enough facts before you could ever get to that
22 stage; and you would have found a person guilty of that
23 premeditated capital murder.

24 A. Okay.

10:58AM 25 Q. You would then have to go through that second

1 phase where someone has been proven to be eligible for
2 the death penalty with one of those aggravating
3 circumstances, and you've already crossed that hurdle.

10:58AM

4 Then you get to the last stage that we've
5 talked about this morning, and that's the stage where the
6 government is required to put on aggravating
7 circumstances. That's something that's bad, as they say,
8 that would cause a person to lean towards the death

10:58AM

9 penalty. And some folks believe, well, if they get to
10 that stage, then it's over. That's enough for the death
11 penalty right there. The law says that you still have to
12 have an open mind about whether the sentence should be
13 death or life.

10:58AM

14 Do you think if you went through those three
15 stages, you would have your mind made up or would you
16 still be open to a life or death sentence?

17 A. I think I could stay open-minded.

10:59AM

18 Q. Okay. And the law also says at that point you
19 have to weigh those aggravating circumstances even if
20 there's no mitigating things presented to you and decide
21 whether a death penalty is sufficient or not. Do you
22 think you could keep your mind open?

23 A. I think I could. I think it would be a hard
24 decision to make.

10:59AM

25 Q. Okay. Well, it's supposed to be.

1 A. Yes.

2 Q. The defense then has the right to put on
3 mitigating evidence. Do you understand what that is?

4 A. Yes, sir.

10:59AM 5 Q. Okay. Is there anything that comes to mind to you
6 of what would be mitigating in a case like this?

7 A. Well, from the slideshow earlier, it said, you
8 know, the childhood circumstances.

9 Q. Okay. And there's no end to the list of what
10:59AM 10 people come up with. They talk about the environment --

11 A. Right.

12 Q. -- somebody that's grown up in child abuse, social
13 problems somebody may have. It's just anything. And
14 some people don't believe any of that is important, and
11:00AM 15 they don't want to listen to it at all. But I gather
16 that's something that you would think would be important
17 for consideration?

18 A. I think so. I feel that they -- you know, I just
19 relate everything to teaching, that, you know, it makes a
11:00AM 20 difference how a child behaves in my classroom depending
21 on what happened before he got there, you know, the home
22 circumstances. It doesn't always excuse a disruptive or
23 a bad behavior, but it's kind of that I guess you would
24 say mitigating. Would that be something like that?

11:00AM 25 Q. Yeah. That's a very good example. Something that

1 explains the behavior.

2 A. Okay.

3 Q. And it's not an excuse for the offense, but it
4 tells you why these things are happening.

11:00AM 5 A. Okay.

6 Q. I know exactly what you're talking about. My wife
7 just retired from teaching. So, I heard that an awful
8 lot.

9 You indicated also that you know a little bit
11:00AM 10 about gangs in prison?

11 A. I did?

12 Q. Well, that's Question 90. It's just a "yes" or
13 "no" question. So, it doesn't really go into depth.

14 A. Oh, have you ever heard of gangs? But only like
11:01AM 15 from the movies.

16 Q. Okay.

17 A. Yeah. It's not a --

18 Q. Have you formed any kind of opinions about how
19 gangs operate or anything like that?

11:01AM 20 A. Not really, no. I've wondered how they do that
21 kind of thing once they're in prison, but I guess they do
22 still socialize so...

23 Q. Okay. Do you know anything about prison life at
24 all?

11:01AM 25 A. No, sir, not really.

1 Q. Know anybody that's been inside a prison?

2 A. None other than a preacher, you know, going in
3 and...

4 Q. A preacher going in?

11:01AM 5 A. Well, going in and preaching, you know.

6 Q. Right. Do you have any personal experience in
7 that?

8 A. No, sir.

9 Q. Do you think that might be a different world that
11:01AM 10 perhaps most of the general public doesn't know anything
11 about?

12 A. I would think so.

13 Q. Okay. Do you have any questions of me, ma'am?

14 A. Yes.

11:02AM 15 Q. Okay.

16 A. And I don't know -- I'm just going to ask you. If
17 you're defending someone and you know they're guilty, are
18 you, by law, still required to defend them; or can you --
19 I mean, would you still defend them if you knew they were
11:02AM 20 guilty?

21 Q. Well, those are personal questions that I probably
22 wouldn't answer; but I can tell you under --

23 A. Okay.

24 Q. -- the law, everyone is presumed to be innocent
11:02AM 25 and everybody is entitled to counsel, whether they were

1 guilty -- not talking about this case. Whether they're
2 guilty or not guilty, everyone is not guilty unless the
3 prosecution, either the state or the government, can
4 prove them guilty beyond a reasonable doubt.

11:02AM

5 A. Right.

6 Q. And our Constitution entitles somebody to a
7 defense. They're not entitled to put on false things,
8 but they're entitled to have their constitutional rights
9 protected.

11:03AM

10 A. Okay.

11 Q. So, does that help you out a little bit?

12 A. Yes, sir.

13 Q. Okay. Thank you.

14 VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF PROSPECTIVE JUROR 66

11:03AM

15 BY MR. MORROW:

16 Q. Good morning, Ms. Stanley.

17 A. Good morning.

18 Q. Judge told you my name is Robert Morrow, and
19 Gerald Bourque and I represent Ricky Fackrell.

11:03AM

20 When you first got up there, I thought, oh,
21 gosh, she talks so softly and she's not going to want to
22 say very much; but you really got going there pretty
23 good. Normally we don't get to answer juror's questions
24 like that. I'm going to get back to that question of
25 yours. But the example you gave about mitigation about

11:03AM

1 children in your classroom, that was very insightful; and
2 I want to kind of talk about that for a little bit.

3 Okay?

11:03AM

4 You and Mr. Barlow talked about mitigation
5 which might help explain behavior, and your example was
6 from your classroom. Something bad happened -- no
7 breakfast, parents fighting -- that might affect how a
8 child behaves. You've seen that, haven't you?

9 A. Yes, sir.

11:03AM

10 Q. What's the worst example of that you've seen in
11 your experience?

12 How long you been a teacher?

11:04AM

13 A. 19 years. I taught adaptive behavior for 3 years,
14 elementary; and I saw a lot of that from -- because the
15 children's home lives were from emotionally disturbed,
16 abuse, and all that kind of stuff. And probably the
17 worst scenario was just over the holidays, starting all
18 over with a child after being home in that environment.
19 I don't have any real specific situation, but it happened
20 all the time.

11:04AM

21 Q. The more you had them with you, you had a better
22 chance to accomplish something and teach them something?

23 A. Yes, sir.

11:04AM

24 Q. And then when they were away a long time, you had
25 to start over basically.

1 A. (Moving head up and down).

2 Q. Well, that is very interesting. I appreciate your
3 work. We know that you don't get paid nearly enough for
4 all you put into it. So, thank you.

11:04AM

5 I want to talk about a different kind of
6 concept of mitigation like that. You may get mitigation
7 that explains somebody's conduct, but you also may get
8 mitigation that just gives you more information about
9 somebody, how they maybe came to be to where you're

11:05AM

10 looking at them in court. That doesn't necessarily
11 explain the conduct but gives you fuller information
12 about who they are to help you decide an appropriate
13 punishment.

14 Does that seem like a good concept?

11:05AM

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. Would you embrace that part as well?

17 A. I think I could. I think so.

18 Q. Would that be just as meaningful to you as the
19 other type of mitigation which might directly explain why
20 somebody behaved a certain way?

11:05AM

21 A. I would have to consider it, for sure, yes.

22 Q. And you would be willing to do that?

23 A. Yes, sir.

24 Q. Okay. Another aspect of our case, we have two
25 defendants here at this table, big table, lots of

11:05AM

1 lawyers. But as I think Mr. Bourque has stressed, our
2 job is to represent Mr. Fackrell; and Mr. Barlow and
3 Mr. Black represent Mr. Cramer. But you as jurors,
4 you're going to hear all this information washing over
11:06AM 5 you at one time; but when you go back to deliberate,
6 you're going to be asked to separate that out and only
7 consider what the government did or didn't prove about
8 Mr. Fackrell or what information we offer and then
9 separately what Mr. Cramer -- information you have about
11:06AM 10 him.

11 Do you think you could do that?

12 A. I think I -- I would have to try.

13 Q. Maybe that math background is going to help you a
14 little bit there?

11:06AM 15 A. Maybe, yeah.

16 Q. That's something that really concerns us because
17 you're going to hear about a whole new environment, about
18 prison and what life is like in there, and we just worry
19 that it would be difficult for you to separate those two
11:06AM 20 things and, so, we want to keep reminding you that at the
21 end of this process, you know, you're going to be asked
22 to make an individual judgment. Can you do that?

23 A. Yes, sir.

24 Q. Now, let's contrast this service with that -- I
11:06AM 25 don't know what you want to call it -- sham of a trial

1 you were on before, you know, when you walked past the
2 woman -- was it a woman?

3 A. Yes.

11:07AM

4 Q. So, that was not something we're going to make an
5 excuse for. This is exactly the opposite of that. So,
6 you're going to be given weeks and weeks of testimony and
7 you're going to be asked then to go back and deliberate
8 individually. Did y'all have much deliberation, much
9 talk?

11:07AM

10 A. Not really, no.

11:07AM

11 Q. We need for you to be able to do that, to talk to
12 the other jurors; but we also need for you to be able to
13 vote your individual conscience about what you think the
14 result should be. You sound like somebody that's going
15 to insist on doing that.

16 A. Yes, I think I could -- I would.

17 Q. Okay. So, you would welcome an opportunity, I
18 would think, to have the opposite of that last experience
19 that you had; is that right?

11:07AM

20 A. Yes.

11:07AM

21 Q. Okay. Being a teacher for all these many years,
22 you're used to making decisions and telling people how to
23 do their work; but could you respect the other jurors'
24 decisions if they were different from yours? Could you
25 understand each of them has to make that same individual

1 choice?

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. Okay. The idea about this being a prison case,
4 too, that's the last thing I want to touch on before I
11:08AM 5 sit back down. This is not going to be something that
6 you would have heard about before. I mean, you know,
7 even a T.V. show or something about prison life. And
8 we're worried that just that one aspect -- you know, this
9 doesn't take place in a convenience store or a home or --
11:08AM 10 it's in prison. So, there's a whole different set of
11 rules and life that you're going to learn about; and we
12 have to make sure that you're open to that and you
13 won't -- just by the fact that our client has been
14 convicted of a crime and is charged with another one, you
11:08AM 15 won't necessarily start him off so far behind that we're
16 never going to catch up.

17 Is that something that you think you could do?

18 A. Yes, sir.

19 Q. Could you talk to me about that just a little bit?

11:08AM 20 A. Well, like you said, you have to pick up where
21 they -- where you start with them. So, rather than have
22 that preconceived notion that they're already a bad
23 person and they've just added another thing to their rap
24 sheet, so, you know, just convict them because of that, I
11:09AM 25 don't think that would be fair.

1 Q. You've dealt with a lot. You've got a lot of
2 information. You've seen a lot of kids. Do you think
3 that you could just accept that information and -- and
4 that's the environment you're going to have to make your
5 decision in. This is a prison case, and that's -- we
6 just want to make sure that you can be fair to us with
7 that being the starting point. Can you?

11:09AM

8 A. I think I could, yes, sir.

9 Q. And the last thing I just want to kind of answer
10 your question just a little bit. Mr. Barlow I think did
11 a really good job of that. But, you know, for us as
12 lawyers, we really do honor the rules; and the
13 presumption of innocence is very important to us. I
14 think what you're going to find in most cases is, you

11:09AM

15 know, it's not so much a question of us making a
16 decision. It's trying to bring both sides of a fact
17 situation to you. Certain things happened. The events
18 themselves may not be in dispute. It's how you should
19 interpret those events. It's a perspective that's

11:09AM

20 important. You can imagine our clients might have a
21 different perspective than other people that were
22 involved in the same events. Do you see what I'm saying?

11:10AM

23 A. Yes, sir.

24 Q. So, we take it as a high honor to be able to come
25 in here and represent someone with their life on the line

11:10AM

1 and have a chance to tell you what it is that we think is
2 important about the facts and ask you to consider them
3 from our perspective; and that's what we do. And the
4 government does the same thing from their perspective.

11:10AM

5 Does that make sense?

6 A. Yes, sir.

7 Q. Thank you so much. I appreciate your time.

8 A. Thank you.

9 VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION OF PROSPECTIVE JUROR 66

11:10AM

10 BY MR. CRAFT:

11 Q. Hello, Ms. Stanley.

12 A. Hi.

13 Q. I hope you remember my name is John Craft. I'm
14 one of the three prosecutors in the case.

11:10AM

15 A. Yes, sir.

16 Q. You getting combat pay for 7th grade math teacher?

17 A. No, sir.

18 Q. I think I can relate at least a little. A million
19 years ago in the late Cretaceous while I was going

11:11AM

20 through graduate school the first time, I substitute
21 taught in middle school. I was selected often not for my
22 necessary intellect but based on my size. I kept the
23 school from being burnt down during the day, and I was
24 popular with the principal.

11:11AM

25 A. I wouldn't want to be a substitute.

1 Q. Right. And I thought it was interesting that you
2 said that you -- and quite naturally so -- look at the
3 world from your perspective and lengthy perspective as a
4 teacher.

11:11AM

5 A. Yes, sir.

6 Q. So, I wanted to ask you about that a little bit.
7 I think that's probably a very even-handed way to look at
8 the world.

11:11AM

9 I would imagine in your classroom there are
10 probably super spellers, for lack of a better word. I
11 mean, they always got their hands in the air; and they're
12 right up front?

13 A. Yes.

11:11AM

14 Q. And then there are probably more diffident
15 students. I used to call them "C minus ghetto." They
16 sit in the back, and they're probably not your favorites.
17 And lucky for me you weren't my 7th grade math teacher
18 because I hated math and there's a rumor going around
19 that I might have been fractious in middle school, but
20 that's just a patent falsehood.

11:12AM

21 So, let me ask you this question: If one of
22 your C minus ghetto dwellers came in and didn't have his
23 assignment and said, "Dog ate my homework," you might
24 meet that with some skepticism, right?

11:12AM

25 A. Right.

1 Q. How about if there were other facts that supported
2 that? Maybe you had a YouTube video of Fido actually
3 eating his homework. Maybe that would change your
4 perhaps negative expectation of that person?

11:12AM

5 A. Yes.

11:12AM

6 Q. Well, I wanted to set that as a context for you
7 because you've heard that there may be some cooperating
8 inmate testimony in this case; and there has been a
9 suggestion that, well, just can't believe those people
10 and names have been called. And in fact, the judge is
11 going to give you an instruction if you're on the jury --
12 and I'll read it to you -- that you should never
13 convict -- and this is with regards to accomplice or
14 informer testimony -- that you, as a juror, should never
15 convict any defendant upon the unsupported testimony of
16 such a witness unless you believe that testimony beyond a
17 reasonable doubt.

11:12AM

11:13AM

18 So, my question is: Would you be open, as you
19 were in the case of your C minus ghetto dweller who had
20 something that you weren't necessarily going to be
21 receptive to because you've had some experience with him,
22 going to be open to looking at other facts that might
23 tend to support that objectively; or would you just throw
24 out the baby with the bath water and say, "Well, I don't
25 like inmate testimony" or "I don't like my C minus ghetto

11:13AM

1 fellow and, so, I'm just not going to listen to what else
2 he has to say"?

3 A. No. I'd have to consider it.

4 Q. So, you'd keep an open mind?

11:13AM 5 A. Yes, sir.

6 Q. All right. I wanted to ask you about your answers
7 to questions 99 A and B.

8 And that was your definition of premeditation.

9 And, of course, you completed those answers before you
11:14AM 10 had the benefit of the instruction that you got from the
11 attorneys this morning about legally what constitutes
12 premeditation.

13 In fact, you said (reading) I think
14 premeditation would be accompanied by motive, not just a
11:14AM 15 reaction to immediate situation.

16 And then you went down in substantial
17 premeditation, you talked about (reading) substantial
18 period of time, plenty of evidence to support that.

19 Do you understand that those things could
11:14AM 20 happen, premeditation and substantial premeditation,
21 based on the facts, in a very short period of time?

22 A. Yes.

23 Q. And you should further understand that of course
24 words are expected to have their plain meaning and you'll
11:14AM 25 get instruction on premeditation, but you may have to

1 make the judgment call based on the facts that you've
2 heard, if you're selected as a juror, what constitutes
3 substantial and also what constitutes insubstantial. So,
4 you'll have to make that judgment.

11:14AM

5 I'll give you an example to see if you see
6 what I'm talking about here. Let's imagine back when you
7 were 18 and dating, your mom said, "Be home at 11:00
8 o'clock sharp." I don't know if that ever happened, but
9 let's just imagine. 11:00 o'clock. 11:00 o'clock comes
10 and goes. You're not home. You're in the doghouse. But
11 you walk in the door one minute later. Was that a
12 substantial or insubstantial deviation from Mom's rules?

11:15AM

13 A. Insubstantial I think.

14 Q. Okay. What if you got to be 30 or 40 minutes
15 late? Might be bouncing toward the --

11:15AM

16 A. Substantial.

17 Q. You see what I'm saying?

18 A. Yes, sir.

19 Q. It's a judgment call based on the person making
20 that judgment, and you might be that person if you're
21 selected for the jury. And you'd make that decision
22 based on the facts and the events that required you to
23 make that decision; is that correct?

11:15AM

24 A. Yes, sir.

11:15AM

25 Q. Thank you.

1 MR. CRAFT: No further questions of this
2 witness.

3 THE COURT: Counsel, are there any questions
4 for the court?

11:15AM 5 MR. CRAFT: Not from the government, judge.

6 MR. MORROW: No, your Honor.

7 MR. BARLOW: No, your Honor.

8 THE COURT: All right. Ms. Stanley, we're
9 finished with respect to this portion of the jury
10 selection process and your name has been added to the
11 list of potential jurors, but you may or may not be
12 selected to serve on the jury. The court's clerk will be
13 in touch with you with regard to your future obligations.
14 So, you're excused temporarily; but you're not discharged
15 from service.

11:16AM

16 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Thank you.

17 THE COURT: Thank you.

18 (Prospective Juror 66 exits the courtroom.)

19 (END OF EXCERPT.)

20

21 **COURT REPORTER'S CERTIFICATION**

22 I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT ON THIS DATE, APRIL 24,
23 2018, THE FOREGOING IS A CORRECT TRANSCRIPT FROM THE
24 RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS.

24

25 /s/
TONYA JACKSON, RPR-CRR